1:Griffiths M-5 (ca. 1940) 1946 AW37 Kol AW37

574 There is no claim of hospitality by a Kol on another Kol if he is unknown to the latter. Even though he be of the same *kurhi* and knows relatives of the persons in the family and is in need of hospitality, he can expect none; any kindness shown him is an act of mercy. For this reason it is unusual for a Kol to ask hospitality at the hands of strangers. He asks for hospitality and shelter for the night only where he is known.

421 PROPERTY AND INHERITANCE. The average Kol does not own a great deal of property, but like most people he is interested in acquiring goods. Even marriage is commonly looked upon as the acquiring of a piece of property in the person of the wife. Almost nowhere are Kols 423 found to own land in the full sense of the term. Even the land upon [427] which their houses and rude huts are built is rented, the usual rent being one rupee a year. This is paid to the *malguzar* who does not disturb them further if the payments are regular. Away from the larger towns where land so often lies waste, it is usually found that no charges are made whatsoever.

422 The personal property held by Kols includes clothes, cooking utensils, tools and a few ornaments if there is money to buy such. Animals are also considered their own property. Apart from the clothes a person wears, the rest of the goods held by the Kols are con- [425 sidered as held by the family as a unit, and the head of the family can 593] sell or exchange only after consultation with the others. Upon the approach of his death the head of the family is expected to make a 763 statement concerning the disposition and division of the property. 428 However if he should suddenly die without making such provision, it does not follow that the elder son, or next in line, inherits the rights of the father concerning the disposition of the goods, and any division or exchange must be decided upon by the family as a whole with the 421 help of someone from the *panch*. While it appears that any member of 425 the family might purchase any article required, either for themselves or for the family, yet after purchase the article becomes the property of the family as a whole, and the purchaser has no right to resell or dispose of it without permission of the head of the family in consultation with the other members.

428 Upon the break-up of the family by death the sons are generally 763 supposed to have equal rights to the property. If, prior to his death, the deceased requested that the elder son should get the larger share, this is accepted. No distinction is said to be made between the children of the "married" wife and the "kept" woman if there are both in the family.

li Griffiths M-5 (ca. 1940) 1946 AW37 Kol AW37

428
Should a dispute arise over the division of the property the matter 578
must be settled by the *panch*. They will probably distribute it as 623
equally as possible among the sons. Should this not be satisfactory 692
to all concerned the sons have the right to appeal to the law courts of
the land and have the matter settled there. Among Kols this is seldom,
if ever, done.

The female members of the family do not enjoy equal rights with 421
the males. A girl, when married, loses her membership in her family, 562
and becomes a member of the new home. When she goes to live with 591
her husband she takes nothing with her apart from her clothes and
some personal adornments. It was noted by Russell and Hiralal that: 171
428

> Succession among the Mundas passes to sons only. Failing there, the property goes to the father or brother if any..... Daughters get no share in the inheritance and are allotted among the sons just like livestock. Thus if a man dies leaving three sons and three daughters and thirty head of cattle, on a division each son would get ten head of cattle and one sister; but should there be only one sister, they wait until she marries and divide the bride price.[1]

This quotation, from their article on the Kols, does not apply to the specific Kol tribe, but nevertheless we found instances of this tendency.

428
There is a difference of opinion as to the disposition of the 422
property if there are no sons and only girls in the family. In many 562
places it was affirmed that property could pass to the daughters if there
were no sons. This was always her own property and nothing could
alienate it from her, not even her marriage. When such a girl is
married she takes her property with her and such property is considered
her own and does not become a portion of her husband's wealth. If [586]
she should ever leave his home due either to divorce or quarrel she
still remains its owner. Keeping it thus in her name and under her
control is a protection to her in case of need. At her death, such
property, if still existing, is supposed to revert to her father's family,
his brothers or their heirs. When a wife dies her clothes are disposed
of as noted in Chapter VII. Her metal jewellery is kept and may
be worn by a new wife or passed on to the sons.

1 Russell and Hiralal, *Op. Cit.*, Vol. III, p. 515.